Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 2, 4, 6, 14, and 18. These changes are on replacement sheets 2/18, 4/18, 6/18, 13/18 and 17/18 respectively. Drawing changes have been made to Figures 2, 4, 6, 14 and 18 as indicated below. Replacement sheets including Figures 2, 4, 6, 14 and 18 are attached. Annotated sheets have not been attached in the belief that the information below provides sufficient explanation for the changes that have been made. No new matter has been added.

Figure 2: Reference to "Shorting module" 204 is corrected to read "Sorting module."

Figure 4: All occurrences of the term "thrash" are corrected to read "thrask."

Figure 6: Block 612 is corrected from "oldest" to "newest" to be consistent with the specification at paragraph [0074] (with reference to the substitute specification attached.)

Figure 14: Reference number 1420 is added, and reference numbers 1421 and 1422 are corrected to point to the appropriate features in the drawing, to make Figure 14 consistent with the specification at paragraph [0104] (with reference to the substitute specification attached.)

Figure 18: Reference numbers 1802, 1804, 1806 and 1808 are added to the figure to make the figure consistent with the specification at paragraph [0156] (with reference to the substitute specification attached.)

Formal Drawings are also included for sheets 1/18, 3/18, 5/18, 7/18, 8/18, 9/18, 10/18, 11/18, 12/18, 14/18, 15/18, 16/18, and 18/18.

Attachment: Replacement Sheets and Formal Drawings.

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office action dated 10/11/2005 is respectfully requested under the provisions of 37 CFR §1.111(b).

Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner approve the attached drawings as applicant's records do not indicate that the Examiner has yet approved any of the drawings (drawings were submitted with the application on 1/16/2002 and with a Petition to Substitute Drawings for Publication received by the PTO on 10/28/2002).

I.   *Amendments*

In the prior Reply submitted in this application, the undersigned inadvertently directed an amendment to the specification that provided the application numbers of two related applications to be made to paragraph [0021]. The subject specification did not have paragraph numbers at the time, and even if it did, the amendment should have been directed to the first paragraph on page 1. In view of this inadvertent error, Applicants believe that the correction could not have been properly made. Applicants are therefore submitting a substitute specification in this application, as an attachment to this Reply. The substitute specification adds paragraph numbers, and also includes the correction to paragraph [0001]. The substitute specification further includes corrections to minor informalities such as deleting duplicate words and supplying missing verbs in sentences. Corrections are also provided to make the specification consistent with the changes to the drawings.

The substitute specification is being submitted in compliance with 37 CFR 1.125(b): a marked up copy of the substitute specification showing the changes made to the immediately prior version of the specification is included. The undersigned hereby states that no new matter has been included in the substitute specification.

Drawing changes have been made to Figures 2, 4, 6, 14 and 18, as indicated in the Amendments to the Drawings section above. Replacement sheets including Figures 2, 4,

6, 14 and 18 are attached (as well as sheets for the formal drawings that were not amended). No new matter was added by these amendments.

Claims 1-22 were pending, and stood rejected, in the subject application as of the mailing of the Office Action to which this is a reply.

In view of the double patenting rejection set forth in the Office Action, and upon closer inspection and comparison of the claims in the subject application with those in the two related applications, Applicants have redirected the claims toward the user interface aspects of the disclosed technology for managing information items within a message-based system. Therefore, Applicants have canceled claims 1 – 21, amended claim 22 and submitted new claims 23 – 40, of which claims 23 and 38 are directed to independent methods.

Support in the specification (with reference of the substitute specification) for the elements of claim 23 is found in Figures 4 – 6 and 9 - 10, and in the discussion of those figures at pages 13 – 15. Support for claim 24 is found in Figure 7 and the description at page 14. Support for claims 25 – 26 is found in Figure 10 and the discussion at pages 15 - 16. Support for claim 27 is found in Figure 14 and in the discussion at page 20. Support for amended claim 22 and new claims 28 and 29 is found in Figures 10 and 12, and in the discussion at pages 15, 17 – 18 and 27, and in particular in paragraphs [0095] and [0134]. Support for claims 30 - 31 is found in Figures 10 and 12, and in the discussion at pages 15 and 18 – 19. Support for claims 32 - 35 is found at pages 6, 9, 15, 22, 25 and 28. Support for claims 36 – 37 is found in Figure 4 and in the discussion at pages 7, 11 and 26. Support for claims 38 – 40 is found in is found in Figures 4 – 6 and 9 - 10, and in the discussion of those figures at pages 13 – 15, and further at pages 25 – 26. These page and figure references are provided by way of example only: the specification provides additional support for the claim elements in claims 23 – 40.

Applicants petition for a one month extension.

II.   Information Disclosure Statement

Applicants are filing an Information Disclosure Statement concurrently with this reply, providing several non-patent literature references in the field of intelligent email agents.

III.   Double Patenting Rejection

Claims 1, 6 and 11 were rejected, in paragraph 2 of the Office Action, under the judicially-created doctrine of nonstatutory (obviousness-type) double-patenting, as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 28 of copending Application No. 10/046,581.

In view of the amendment herein canceling claims 1, 6 and 11, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

IV.   Rejections under 35 USC §112

Claims 1-22 were rejected, in paragraph 4 of the Office Action, 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention. The basis of the rejection was the use of the word "thrask" in these claims.

In view of the amendment herein canceling claims 1 – 21 and providing new claims 23 – 40 which do not include the term "thrask," it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

V.   Rejections under 35 USC §102(b)

Claims 1-22 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as anticipated by Chandra et al. (U.S. 2002/0138582, hereinafter "Chandra".)

In view of the amendment herein canceling claims 1 – 21 and providing new claims 23 – 40 from which amended claim 22 now depends, it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action recites portions of Chandra as teaching certain ones of the elements in claims 1 – 22 that also appear in claims 23 – 40. For that reason, some comments follow about the interpretation of the teachings of Chandra that are presented in the Office Action. First, the Office Action states that paragraphs [0034] to [0046] in Chandra teach a method for managing information items within a message-based system. Paragraph [0043] in particular discusses the display of an electronic message:

> [0043] According to another aspect, a method for processing a request to display an electronic message is disclosed. First message data is generated. The first message data defines at least a first message portion and one or more navigation regions for one or more other message portions of a multiple-part electronic message having a plurality of message portions. The first message data is provided to a client. A request is received from the client for a second portion of the electronic message selected from among the other message portions. Second message data is generated which, when processed at a user interface of the client, causes the client to display the second portion of the electronic message. The second message data is provided to the client.

Paragraph [0043] discusses the display of a single multi-part electronic message and does not disclose the elements of either of new claims 23 and 38. There is no discussion in paragraph [0043] of displaying within multiple panes of a message-based system, and there is no teaching of displaying a first viewing pane showing a plurality of titled data items each representing a collection of information items associated with the titled data item, as required in claims 23 and 38.

The Office Action refers to reference numerals 292 and 294 as teaching the element of claim 1, now canceled, of "generating a plurality of thrasks, each of the thrasks including at least one information item having a set of metadata." These references will be discussed in the context of claims 23 and 38, which refer to a titled data item representing a collection of information items associated with the titled data item.

Reference numerals 292 and 294 are included in Figure 2C, which in turn presents a diagram of an example graphical appearance of a transportable application, according to one embodiment. Several references to transportable applications in this section of the disclosure suggest that a transportable application is an email: "Each user is sent only a

single copy of the transportable application, even if there are multiple responses to it" [0247]; "In one embodiment, a transportable application that is sent in the form of an HTML e-mail to a recipient may comprise a script" [0259]; the discussion in paragraph [0248], and, in particular, the discussion in paragraph [0252]:

> [0252] In general, interacting with a transportable application involves receiving a message that references or contains a transportable application, entering a response, and using one or more transportable application commands. A user may receive a transportable application as a message carried using any suitable transport mechanism. In this description, for purposes of illustrating a simple example, the transport mechanism is assumed to be e-mail. However, any other suitable transport mechanism may be used, such as wireless gateways, voice and other multimedia protocols, etc. Further, various e-mail protocols may be used, such as SMTP, MAPI, etc..

Chandra discusses transportable applications as including containers and building blocks. In particular, containers are defined at paragraph [0259]:

> [0259] Each transportable application comprises one or more containers. Each container is implemented in the form of a programmatic object in an object-oriented programming environment. Each container may be a root container or an embedded container. Each transportable application has one root container, and one or more embedded containers.

Chandra further discloses that "containers coordinate presentation of content of contained building blocks." [00261] Chandra then discusses building blocks, at paragraph [0291], by stating that "building blocks of a transportable application define the specific appearance, content, and functions of the transportable application. Each building block comprises data elements, logical elements, and presentation elements."

In the embodiment shown in Figure 2C, a transportable application is displayed in a transportable application window 280. Figure 2C discloses a single window 280. Other features of the window (i.e., a command options bar 282, an action request or note 284, a header bar 286, and one or more pages 287A, 287B) all appear in the same window. Persons of skill in the art of user interface design consider display features such as command options bars and header bars to be part of window 280 and not separate viewing panes within window 280. Even assuming page 287A shown in Figure 2C is a separate viewing pane within window 280, for the sake of argument, Figure 2C still does

not disclose the three separate viewing panes described in claims 23 and 38. In fact, Chandra discusses the receipt and handling of a transportable application as follows:

> [0253] When a user receives a transportable application, the user receives a specially designated e-mail message in the in-box of the e-mail client of the user. To begin interacting with the transportable application, the user opens the message. In response, the contents of the transportable application are automatically dynamically updated from a server, such as application server 202 of FIG. 2A. The transportable application is also updated when a user submits a response.
> [0254] Specific processes for interaction with a transportable application depend on what pages and building blocks are contained in the transportable application. ... In general, interaction involves selecting a desired page using a navigation area 287B and locating a response button. Each building block has a response button such as "Enter Response," "Add Image," "Add Table Row," etc. The response button is selected. In response, the system generates and sends an Enter Response window to the client 102, which displays it as a new graphical user interface window.

The reference to the user receiving a specially designated e-mail message in the in-box of the e-mail client suggests the use of a standard message system with a standard in-box window. None of this discussion talks about using three viewing different panes within the viewer of the message system.

Chandra discloses several other figures that show user interfaces for interacting with messages. Figure 12 is particularly interesting. FIG. 12 is a diagram of an example transportable application that contains an inline Web page. In this example embodiment, a transportable application 1200 is shown in a view from a graphical user interface of an e-mail client program 1210. Transportable application 1200 comprises a header 1208 and an inline Web page building block 1212. The building block 1212 includes a navigation header 1201 and a Web page image area 1202 that displays the inline Web page. See Paragraph [0491].

Even assuming that Web page image area 1202 is considered to be a separate viewing pane within email client 1210, Figure 12 and its accompanying discussion do not disclose the element of claim 23 that requires displaying a first viewing pane within the viewer of the message-based system; the first viewing pane showing a plurality of titled data items; each titled data item representing a collection of information items associated

with the titled data item; at least one titled data item including a message as one of the information items in the collection; the first viewing pane further showing, for each titled data item, a visual indication that the titled data item includes a message having a message status of unopened as one of the information items associated with the titled data item. Figure 12 and its accompanying discussion also do not disclose the element of claim 23 that requires displaying a plurality of information data items in a second viewing pane within the viewer of the message-based system; each information data item indicating one of the information items associated with the titled data item selected by the user; one of the plurality of information data items indicating the message having the message status of unopened. Figure 12 and its accompanying discussion also do not disclose the element of claim 38 that requires displaying a plurality of information data items in a second viewing pane within the viewer of the message-based system; each information data item indicating one of the information items associated with the titled data item selected by the user; the second viewing pane showing the message and the at least one of the attached document and the reference URL as separate and selectable information data items.

The term "pane" is known as a term of art in windows-based user interfaces. Chandra, in fact, discusses the disadvantages of using multiple panes for viewing different parts of messages, at paragraph [0019]:

> [0019] Other systems display multimedia attachments in a separate pane of a graphical user interface window that is displaying the message. For example, in Microsoft Outlook, when multimedia attachments are present, they are displayed at the bottom of the message window, divided from the message body by a separator bar. A disadvantage of this approach is that it is hard to correlate the attachment with a particular part of the message body.

It would seem, then, that a more important concern to Chandra is to have a graphical user interface provides for a way to create, deliver, receive, and display e-mail messages in which related content is correlated and accessed without scrolling or similar cumbersome operations. Paragraph [0023]. If Chandra had intended that the graphical user interface of the transportable application use more than one viewing pane, such an interface would be clearly disclosed in Chandra.

In summary, the teachings of Chandra that are discussed above do not anticipate claims 22 – 40.

Reconsideration Requested

Reconsideration of the subject application is requested, in view of the above remarks.

The undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025. This also constitutes a request for any needed extension of time and authorization to charge all fees therefor to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025. Applicant points out that the ending date of a one month extension was 2/11/06 that fell on a Saturday. This Office Action Reply is being mailed on Monday 2/13/06 and thus should only require a one month extension.

Should any additional issues remain, or if I can be of any additional assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me at (650) 812-4259.

Respectfully submitted,

DANIEL B. CURTIS
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 39,159
(650) 812-4259
dbcurtis@parc.com

Attachments: Replacement Drawing Sheets 2/18, 4/18, 6/18, 13/18 and 17/18 and
Formal Drawing Sheets
        Substitute Specification (without mark-up).
        Substitute Specification (with mark-up showing amendments).